UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,139	09/09/2003	Ed H. Frank	14182US02	3006

23446   7590   05/19/2008
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD
500 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 3400
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER
HOANG, HIEU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but found unpersuasive.

35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Since no explicit definition of a computer-readable medium can be found in the specification, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, a computer-readable medium having stored thereon, a computer program, can be read by one skilled in the art as any of a transmission media (cable, wire, wireless media), signals or signal-carrying waves and is therefore non-statutory for not falling in any one of the four categories: a process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter.

35 U.S.C 102 and 103

Applicants argue that SA (security associations) of Laurila has nothing to do with authenticating the device at each access point AP. The examiner respectfully traverses. Laurila discloses that SA is transferred between various APs to avoid the need for a new authentication key that is used to authenticate both ends of the communications pair that is made up of a mobile terminal and an AP (col. 5 lines 43-50). Furthermore, authentication information related to said initial authentication is just any information that can is related to the authentication of a device, and not neccesarily be authentication parameters involved the the authentication process. So authentication information can be read as an SA.

Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach "servicing said access device by one of said first access point, said second access point and said third access point based on said initial authentication." This limitation can be read as "servicing said access device by one of said first access point based on said initial authentication." Servicing the device by the the <u>first</u> access point <u>based on</u> said initial authentication is inherently disclosed by Laurila (fig. 2, old AP servicing mobile terminal using initial authentication). Furthermore, the fact that Laurila discloses that SA to be tranferred in advance of resuming service at a second AP can read on "servicing the device by the the <u>second</u> access point <u>based on</u> said initial authentication" (see fig. 3, SA is transferred before resuming service)

Further arguments will be provided as deemed needed.

HH

05/15/2008